Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.						
TRANSMITTAL FORM  (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			Application Number	10/773349		
			Filing Date	February 6, 2004		
			First Named Inventor	Curt D. Gi	Curt D. Gilmore	
			Art Unit	2125	2125	
			Examiner Name	Kidest Bahta		
Total Number of Pages in This Submission			Attorney Docket Number	9895-000001		
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)						
☐ Fee Transmittal Form		Drawing(s)		After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC)		
Fee Attached		Licensing-related Papers		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences		
Amendment / Reply		Petition		Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
After Final		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Proprietary Information		
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		Status Letter		
Extension of Time Request		Terminal Disclaimer		Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):		
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund  CD, Number of CD(s)		Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance; Acknowledgment Postcard		
Information Disclosure Statement						
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Remarks The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 08-0750. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.				
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application						
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53						
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT						
Firm <i>or</i> Individual name	or Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.		Attorney Name C. Joseph R. Papp	1	eg. No. 9115	
Signature			400			
Date December 3, 2004						
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING						
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.						
Typed or printed nam	e Joseph R. Par	P /		Express Mail Label No.	EV 570 163 551 US (12/3/2004)	
Signature Data December 2 2004						

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO:

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.





## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

10/773349

Filing Date:

February 6, 2004

Applicant:

Curt D. Gilmore, et al

**Group Art Unit:** 

2125

Examiner:

Kidest Bahta

Title:

Error Proofing System For Portable Tools

Attorney Docket:

9895-000001

Mail Stop Issue Fee Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Sir:

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear [the Examiner's] reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted, especially since the statement may unfairly focus on certain reasons for allowance which are not reflected by the prosecution history. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. For example, while Applicant believes the claims are allowable, Applicant may not unequivocally agree that patentability resides solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified, or that each feature or combination of features identified, or that equivalents of any

of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the reasons for allowance do not separately address the subject matter of all the claims, Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference that the non-addressed claims fail to present other reasons for patentability apart from the patentability of the claims which were specifically addressed by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

√ðseph R. Papp, Rég ∕No. 20115 ∕HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicants

Dated: December 3, 2004

P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, Mi. 48303 248-641-1600

9895-000001